Amendments to the Drawings:

None

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

RECORD OF TELEPHONE CALL FROM EXAMINER

This will acknowledge a telephone call from the Examiner on 04 Feb 2010, which call pointed out that in the amendment filed 24 DEC 2009, Applicants failed to define R^1, R^2, R^3 … *etc.* Those substituents are well defined in the specification. Applicants have moved those definitions from the specification into Claim 1. As suggested by the Examiner, Applicants have omitted the halogens. Applicants' attorney is not certain how to underline the claim so the original and current changes are both underlined. Applicants thanks the Examiner for the notification and would have responded immediately except for the unusual snow fall that paralyzed the Washington area for over the past week.

ORIGINAL RESPONSE

The Office Action of September 08, 2009, stated that Claims 1-11 are pending in the application. Claim 7 is objected to because the claim is wrongly numbered. Claims 1, 2 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph as being indefinite because the claims defined the variables R^1-R^{12} as a group making it unclear as to which group Applicants are claiming. Claims 1-11 (actually 1-10) are rejected as obvious from Sotoyama (US Pat. 7,326,476) within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Claims 1-11 are rejected on the ground non-statutory double patenting over US 7,135,243. Applicants respectfully traverse all objections and rejections of the claims in this application.

Claim 7 is objected to because the claim is wrongly numbered. In re-reading the claims, as originally filed, Applicants realized that Claim 7 was never separated by a paragraph break. The claims have been amended to display Claim 7 as a separate paragraph. This amendment should obviate this objection.

Claims 1, 2 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph as being indefinite because the claims defined the variables R^1-R^{12} as a group making it unclear as to which group Applicants are claiming. Applicants have made editorial changes to clarify the original meaning of these claims. These amendments should obviate this rejection.

Claims 1-11 (actually 1-10) are rejected as obvious from Sotoyama (US Pat. 7,326,476) within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. In the Sotoyama patent, anthanthrene formula 101 with R101-R112 was clearly defined as containing one or more amino groups formula 102. In Applicants experience, anthanthrene formula 101 containing the amino group had a much lower luminescent quantum efficiency as compared to the Formula 101 without amino groups or non-amino groups in R position. There is a clear distinction between what is taught by Sotoyama and the instant invention. Applicants are making clear they are not claiming amine groups.

Claims 1-11 are rejected on the ground non-statutory obviousness double patenting over Claims 1-11 of US 7,135,243. Applicants do not understand the need for this rejection. Both inventions were filed the same date and, under current law, would expire the same date. In the interests of moving this application forward, The United States, by its attorneys, files a terminal disclaimer. This should obviate all such rejections.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. The Director is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or underpayments under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 & 1.17; and credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. **19-2201** held in the name of U.S. Army Materiel Command.

Respectfully submitted,
Intellectual Property Counsel
U.S. Army Research Laboratory

By /A. David Spevack/

A. David Spevack
Reg. No. 24,743
Tel.: 301-394-1714
FAX: 301-394-3972
e-mail: dave.spevack@us.army.mil

ATTN: RDRL-LOC-I
2800 Powder Mill Road
Adelphi, Maryland 20783-1197

Date: 2010-02-16

Attachments:
(1) Terminal Disclaimer